

NOTE: This is the office action sent on 11/17/2008 that the applicants have already received and responded to. This action is for documentation purposes only, and no response is needed from Applicant.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is response to communication: RCE filed on 09/19/2008.
2. Claims 1-6 and 17-20 are currently pending in this application. Claims 1 and 17 are independent claims.

Petition

3. The new 37 CFR 1.78(a)(3) petition to accept an unintentionally delayed claim under 35 U.S.C. 120 for the benefit of priority to the prior filed nonprovisional application has been granted. The previous rejection utilizing the Jakoubek US Patent Application Publication 2004/0052372 has been withdrawn, as the pending application is now a continuation of the Jakoubek reference.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 05/19/2008 have been fully considered and are moot in view of new ground(s) of rejections.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The previous 112 rejections have been withdrawn in response to applicants' amendments and arguments.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-4, 17, 18, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Campbell US Patent No. 6,944,475 (hereinafter Campbell), and in view of Thedens et al. US Patent No. 6,041,035 (hereinafter Thedens).

As per claim 1, Campbell teaches a multi-channel radio operating with multiple security levels, comprising: more than one input/output (Figure 1; col. 4 lines 45-55; col. 9 lines 15-34; Figure 7); a first common bus coupled to the more than one input/output (Figure 1 and Figure 2; col. 4 lines 45-55; col. 4 line 62-col. 5 line 11; col. 6 lines 29-33; col. 9 line 15-34; Figure 7); a first processor coupled to the common bus (Figure 1, Figure 4 item 428, Figure 7; col. 9 lines 15-34;); a second processor coupled to the first set of processor (Figure 4 item 440; col. 7 line 65 to col. 8 line 5); more than one transceiver (Figure 1); each transceiver being coupled to at least one of the processors of the first processors (Figure 1).

Although Campbell teaches the use of two set of processors, the sets of processors each only include one processor. However, multiple processor sets connected by a bus in a multi-channel communication system is taught throughout Thedens, such as in shown in Figures 1 and 2. Thedens also teaches two common busses coupled to the first and second set of processors in these figures and also in col. 5 lines 15-60. Further, the first processors of the first set of processors encodes information received from one of the input or outputs, as taught in col. 4 lines 25-40. Thedens also teaches wherein the second common bus directs an encoded information so that it is received by an intended processor of the second set of more than one processors and not received or understood by another processor of the second set of more than one processors (col. 5 line 60 to col. 6 line 14).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include multiple busses connecting multiple processors. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such an addition to prioritize highly sensitive materials in a communications systems, as taught by Thedens in col. 1 line 50 to col. 2 line 5.

As per claim 2, Thedens teaches wherein the first set of more than one processors are red processing devices (Figure 1).

As per claim 3, Thedens teaches wherein the second set of more than one processors are black processing devices (Figure 1)

As per claim 4, Thedens teaches wherein the first set of more than one processors are red processing devices (Figure 1)

Claim 17 is rejected using the same basis of arguments used to reject claim 1 above.

Claim 18 is rejected using the same basis of arguments used to reject claim 2 above.

Claim 20 is rejected using the same basis of arguments used to reject claim 3 above.

8. Claims 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Campbell and Thedens as applied above, and further in view of Fletcher US SIR Reg. No. H1,836 (hereinafter Fletcher).

As per claim 5, the Campbell, and Thedens all teach switching devices, but does not explicitly teach wherein the first common bus is an Ethernet packet switching device. However, using Ethernet devices are well known in the art, as pertaining to multi-channel communication radios, and are taught throughout Fletcher, such as in col. 16 lines 20-30.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the Campbell combination with Fletcher. Fletcher teaches that a switching modules may include many components, such as busses and Ethernet interfaces. As Ethernet is well known in the art and used commonly to those in the field, it would have been obvious to make a switch compatible for Ethernet packets. Providing an Ethernet switch would make the invention more practical and adaptable to use as Ethernet is well known and used frequently.

9. Claims 6 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Campbell and Thedens as applied above, and further in view of Mahany US Patent No. 5,960,344 (hereinafter Mahany).

As per claim 6, the Campbell combination teaches the use of a bus, but does not explicitly recite PCI busses. However, PCI busses are well known in the art, and may be implemented in multi-channel radios, such as taught by Mahany in col. 9 lines 10-21.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of the Campbell combination with Mahany. PCI busses are well known in the art and used commonly, and it would have been obvious to incorporate PCI busses to make the systems compatible with the systems on the market.

Claim 19 is rejected using the same basis of arguments used to reject claim 6 above.

Conclusion

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JASON K. GEE whose telephone number is (571)272-6431. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 7:00 am to 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kambiz Zand can be reached on (571) 272-3811. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jason Gee

Application/Control Number: 10/643,451

Page 7

Art Unit: 2434

Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2400
11/10/2008

/Kambiz Zand/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2434